

6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

6.1 Introduction

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines mandates that an EIR include a comparative evaluation of the proposed Project with a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. This section thus describes alternatives that satisfy these two criteria, i.e., alternatives which both: (a) attain most of the Project's basic objectives; and, (b) substantially lessen the Project's potentially significant environmental effects. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)." Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context in which "the rule of reason" is measured against when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

As described in Section 2, Project Description, the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would serve as a land use policy document that would guide future development projects within the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would allow a mix of land uses, such as corporate office, manufacturing, warehouse, small-scale retail, hotel, restaurant, and other ancillary support uses. The proposed Specific Plan would also increase the allowed development intensities for land uses in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area.

The proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would amend the current zoning for the project area, allowing development in the three following land use districts:

- ❖ **Moffett Park - General Commercial (MP-C):** The MP-C District provides for 13.01 acres of limited commercial development with an allowable intensity of .40 FAR. Total development potential within the MP-C District equates to approximately .25 million square-feet. The MP-C District is intended for the construction, use, and occupancy of buildings for hotels, restaurants, retail sales and services, and professional services.
- ❖ **Moffett Park – Transit Oriented Development (MP-TOD):** The MP-TOD District provides for 462.33 acres of commercial, office and industrial development within the direct vicinity of the existing light rail line at an allowable intensity of .55 FAR. Total development potential within the MP-TOD District is 11.06 million square-feet. The MP-TOD zoning district is intended for the construction, use, and occupancy of buildings for office, research, limited manufacturing, hotels, restaurants, financial institutions, retail sales and services, professional services and similar compatible uses. Accessory uses for the benefit of onsite employees (e.g., recreation facilities, cafeterias) are also allowed and encouraged. The purpose of the MP-TOD District is to encourage higher intensity uses that can best take advantage of locations in close proximity to the Tasman light rail corridor. The allowed FAR of .55 may be increased to a maximum of .70 for development projects that meet a set of criteria identified within the Specific Plan.

- ❖ **Moffett Park - Industrial (MP-I):** The MP-I District provides for 663.20 acres of general industrial development with an allowable intensity of .40 FAR and .50 for warehouses. Total development potential within the MP-I District equates to approximately 11.55 million square-feet. The MP-I zoning district is intended for the construction, use, and occupancy of buildings for office, research, limited manufacturing, hotels, restaurants, and financial institutions. Accessory uses for the benefit of onsite employees (e.g., recreation facilities, cafeterias, etc.) are also allowed and encouraged. The allowed floor area ratio of .40 may be increased to a maximum of 0.50 for development projects that meet a set of criteria identified within the Specific Plan.

In addition to these districts, the Specific Plan permits an additional 2,000,000 square-feet of floating development potential within the Specific Plan Area. The 2,000,000 square-feet can be applied to any development project in the Specific Plan Area, provided the project adheres to specific criteria established in the Specific Plan. Development projects that are allocated additional square-footage from the floating pool would be allowed to exceed the base FAR of the project site. Parcels located within the MP-TOD District would be permitted to exceed the allowable .55 FAR to a maximum .70 FAR. Parcels within the MP-I District would be permitted to exceed the allowable .40 FAR to a maximum .50 FAR. Floating pool space would be allocated on a first-come, first-serve basis until the entire pool has been exhausted. The development potential of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under the proposed Specific Plan is detailed in Table 6-1, below:

The proposed Specific Plan would also include a transfer of development rights program, which would allow owners of underdeveloped properties to transfer or sell their development rights to another property that wishes to develop beyond the base FARs.

Currently, there is a total of 15,616,373 square-feet of developed building floor space in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment projects in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area could result in the construction of 8,794,506 additional square-feet of building space (floor area) beyond existing conditions. On average, 340 square-feet of industrial/office space can support one job. Therefore, the future development that would be facilitated as a result of implementation of the proposed Specific Plan has the potential to generate approximately 25,588 additional jobs.

The objectives of the proposed Specific Plan are described in detail in Section 2.4, Project Objectives. The potentially significant impacts that would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Specific Plan are set forth in Section 3.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures, of this EIR. As noted in Section 3.0, most of the potentially significant impacts identified can be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures. However, significant unavoidable impacts related to traffic, air quality, and population and housing would occur as a result of the proposed project. In addition, the project would also contribute to cumulative air quality, population and housing, growth-inducing, water supply, energy, and traffic impacts (refer to Section 4.0, *Cumulative Impacts*, and Section 7.0, *Growth-Inducing Effects of the Proposed Project*).

**Table 6-1
Building Potential of Moffett Park Specific Plan Area
Under the Proposed Specific Plan**

Specific Plan Sub-District	Parcel Acreage	Developable Acreage ¹	FAR ²	Development Potential: Total Allowed Building Square-Footage
MP-TOD	462.3	392.5	.55	9.4 million
MP-I	681.1	663.2	.40	11.6 million
MP-C	13.0	13.0	.40	246,000 ³
Special Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.47 million ⁴
Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative (excludes existing and/or recently approved projects)⁵	1,156.4	1,068.7	N/A	22.7 million
Total Development Potential of this Alternative (includes existing and/or recently approved projects)⁶	1,156.4	1,068.7	N/A	24.33 million

Notes:

1. "Developable Acreage" for each area excludes existing SCVWD right-of-ways and U.S. Military Parcels.
2. Allowable development intensities may increase up to .70 FAR in the MP-TOD district and .50 FAR in the MP-I district. Development intensity increases in these districts may not exceed 2,000,000 square-feet.
3. Approximately 246,000 square feet of existing commercial space is currently developed within the Specific Plan on several parcels that total 13.0 acres. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that these parcels are fully developed with viable uses and would remain frozen (i.e., new development/redevelopment would not likely occur on the commercial parcels because they are already developed with viable uses).
4. Development Reserve may allocate square footage to parcels in MP-TOD and MP-I Zones, up to 2 million square feet, less any development entitled after January 1, 2001. "Actual" reserve availability is approximately 1.47 million square feet due to projects approved since January 1, 2001.
5. The "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative" does not consider the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects.
6. The "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" considers the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. Several existing and/or approved projects have FARs greater than the FARs allowed under this alternative. Therefore, when considering existing and recently approved conditions, the "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" is greater than the "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative".

Source: RBF Consulting, Draft Moffett Park Specific Plan, August 2002.

Based on the purpose of the alternatives analysis as described above and as prescribed in Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the following alternatives were selected by the City of Sunnyvale for evaluation in this EIR.

- ❖ Alternative A: No-Project Alternative (as required by Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines): assumes that the proposed Specific Plan is not adopted and future development in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area occurs under the direction of the existing General Plan and Zoning Code. Alternative A would allow for development intensities of .50 for the existing transit core and .35 for the remaining general industrial parcels.
- ❖ Alternative B: assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .70 FAR for the MP-TOD zone and .50 FAR for the MP-I and MP-C

zones. Alternative B would not include the floating pool of two million square-feet or the Transfer of Development Rights Program.

- ❖ Alternative C: assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .50 FAR for all parcels in the Specific Plan Area. All parcels in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would be zoned MP-I. Alternative C would not include the MP-TOD and MP-C zones, the floating pool of two million square-feet, or the Transfer of Development Rights Program.
- ❖ Alternative D: assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .55 FAR for the MP-TOD zone and .40 for the MP-I and MP-C zones. Alternative D would not include the floating pool of two million square-feet, or the Transfer of Development Rights Program.
- ❖ Alternative E: assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .50 FAR for the MP-TOD and .35 for the MP-I. Alternative E would also allow the construction of residential development (greater than 35 units per acre), mixed use, and increased pedestrian amenities near transit stations. Alternative E would not include the MP-C zone, the floating pool of two million square-feet, or the Transfer of Development Rights Program.

The analysis of project alternatives includes the base assumption that all applicable mitigation measures associated with the Project would be implemented with the appropriate alternatives. However, applicable mitigation measures may be scaled to reduce or avoid the potential impacts of the alternative under consideration, and may not precisely match those identified for the Project. If a specific impact is not raised within the discussion of an alternative, it is because the effect is expected to be the same as that associated with the implementation of the proposed Project.

6.2 Alternative A Analysis: “No-Project” Alternative

DESCRIPTION

Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a “no-project” alternative be evaluated in comparison to the proposed Project. Section 15126.6(e) also requires that the no-project alternative discuss the existing conditions that were in effect at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

The No-Project alternative assumes that adoption of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan does not occur, and that future development in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area occurs under the direction of the existing City of Sunnyvale General Plan and Zoning Code. The General Plan currently allows for development intensities of .50 for the existing transit core and .35 for the remaining general industrial parcels in the Specific Plan Area. The development potential of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under Alternative A is detailed in Table 6-2 below:

Table 6-2 Building Potential of Moffett Park Specific Plan Area Under Alternative A: No-Project Alternative				
Specific Plan Sub-District	Parcel Acreage	Developable Acreage¹	FAR	Development Potential: Total Allowed Building Square-Footage
MP-TOD	144.8	144.8	.50	3.2 million
MP-I	1,011.6	993.7	.35	15.1 million
MP-C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative (excludes existing and/or recently approved projects)²	1,156.4	1,138.5	N/A	18.3 million
Total Development Potential of this Alternative (includes existing and/or recently approved projects)³	1,156.4	1,138.5	N/A	18.3 million
Notes: 1. "Developable Acreage" for each area excludes existing SCVWD right-of-ways parcels, but includes U.S. Military Parcels. 2. The "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative" does not consider the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. 3. The "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" considers the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. Several existing and/or approved projects have FARs greater than the FARs allowed under this alternative. Therefore, when considering existing and recently approved conditions, the "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" is greater than the "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative".				
Source: RBF Consulting, Draft Moffett Park Specific Plan, August 2002.				

Currently, there are 15,616,373 square-feet of building space in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment projects in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area could result in the construction of 2,688,388 additional square-feet of building space under the No-Project Alternative. On average, 340 square-feet of industrial/office space can support one job. Therefore, Alternative A has the potential to generate approximately 7,907 jobs within the Moffett Park Specific Plan.

This alternative would avoid some project-related impacts, both positive and negative, as described in the subsections below. In addition, the objectives of the proposed project would not be achieved with the implementation of the No-Project Alternative.

6.3 Alternative A Impact Evaluation

AESTHETICS

Future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in less than significant visual impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures. The visual impacts of Alternative A would be difficult to assess since there are a number of uses and architectural styles that could potentially be developed in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Future development projects (depending on the size and type of use) would likely look similar to the

existing development projects in the area. Therefore, the overall character or image of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would not substantially change beyond existing conditions. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.1 could be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts that could occur from the implementation of this Alternative to a less than significant level.

Alternative A would not likely reduce the less than significant visual impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact. In addition, this alternative could avoid the potentially *positive* visual impacts of the proposed project because it would not implement the design guidelines and regulations that are included in the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, future development projects would be subject to less-restrictive design controls, standards, and/or requirements under the No-Project Alternative when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, the less than significant aesthetics impacts generated by Alternative A could be considered slightly greater than the less than significant aesthetic impacts of the proposed project.

AIR QUALITY

Future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Impacts related to construction-related emissions (PM₁₀) could be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures. Vehicle trips generated by future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would generate emissions that would exceed air quality standards. Mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts related to vehicle emissions.

As with implementation of the Specific Plan, construction-related emissions generated by future development projects under the Alternative A scenario could also be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures.

The development potential of Alternative A (total of 18.3 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative A (estimated at 7,907 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, vehicle trips and related vehicle emissions to the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would be substantially reduced with Alternative A.

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could result in potentially *positive* air quality impacts because it would include policies and programs that would intensify development within the transit corridor and improve pedestrian linkages between transit stops and businesses. Improving the connection between transit and businesses could encourage the increased use of light rail and bus as alternative modes of transportation. The increased use of public transportation could reduce vehicle traffic trips and thereby reduce vehicle emissions.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential biological resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative A would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. Under both Alternative A and the proposed Specific Plan, future development could occur in the Moffett Park area. This potential future development under either the “no-project” Alternative A or proposed Specific Plan

would implement mitigation measures, if necessary, on a future project-by-project basis to reduce potential biological resource impacts to less than significant levels.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential cultural resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative A would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed Specific Plan, future development under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential geology and soils impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative A would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed Specific Plan, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential geologic impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative A would not likely reduce the less than significant geology and soils impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative A (total of 18.3 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative A (estimated at 7,907 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, in the event of a seismic earthquake, this Alternative would expose less building space and fewer people to potential harm or danger than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative A would result in slightly less potential geology and soil impacts than the proposed project.

HAZARDS

Potential hazards impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative A would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential hazards impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative A would not likely reduce the less than significant hazards impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative A (total of 18.3 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative A (estimated at 7,907 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative A would expose less building space and fewer people to potential hazards than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative A would result in slightly less hazards impacts than the proposed project.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Future development projects under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would result in short-term construction and long-term operational hydrology and water quality impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts.

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative A would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative.

The proposed Specific Plan would include design and development standards that call for a minimum of 20% of the net lot area to be landscaped within all zoning districts within the Specific Plan Area. Future redevelopment projects would be required to comply with these standards if the Specific Plan is adopted. As described in Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, the implementation of these design and development standards would reduce stormwater flows for both 10-year and 100-year storms. Therefore, the implementation of the Specific Plan would result in potentially positive impacts in regards to drainage and water quality.

LAND USE

The proposed Specific Plan would allow for future development projects that would be compatible with the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area. The proposed Specific Plan would also be consistent with the overall goals and policies of the City of Sunnyvale General Plan. Therefore, less than significant land use impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. The No-Project Alternative would not result in any changes in land use or zoning policies. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of Alternative A.

NOISE

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would involve short-term and long-term noise impacts generated by construction activities and the introduction of additional traffic along the project study area roadways and intersections. Although project impacts would be considered less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures, Alternative A would likely reduce traffic noise impacts because it would generate substantially less employment and traffic than the proposed project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale, which would further impact the City's jobs/housing ratio. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Alternative A would also increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale through the future redevelopment and intensification of the site. The development potential of Alternative A (total of 18.3 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative A (estimated at 7,907 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative A would result in substantially less

jobs/housing ratio impacts than the proposed project. However, the implementation of Alternative A would not likely reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire, police, and school services in the City of Sunnyvale. Potentially significant impacts would likely be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. Future development that would occur with Alternative A would also increase the demand for public services beyond existing conditions. Mitigation measures could also be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts. The development potential of Alternative A (total of 18.2 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative A would be considered slightly less than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As described in Section 3.12, Traffic and Circulation, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would facilitate future development that would generate additional local and regional vehicle trips. Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur along several freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections despite the implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of Alternative A would reduce the level of impact at all freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections because it would generate substantially less local and regional vehicle trips. However, Alternative A would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts at several freeway intersections, roadways, and isolated intersections despite the implementation of mitigation measures. Nonetheless, the impacts that would occur with the Implementation of Alternative A would be considered substantially less than the impacts that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.

UTILITIES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for public utilities. However, the Specific Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of the utility and infrastructure requirements required to service the proposed land uses. Implementation of the Specific Plan would require major improvements to utility and infrastructure systems, including water, wastewater, and storm drain improvements. Construction of these improvements would result in short-term impacts that would be considered less than significant.

Future development that would occur with the implementation of Alternative A would also increase the demand for public utilities. The development potential of Alternative A (total of 18.2 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative A would be considered slightly less than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

6.4 Alternative A Conclusion

Alternative A would result in fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project. This alternative would avoid and/or reduce most of the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed

project. However, this Alternative would not likely reduce the significant and unavoidable population and housing, and traffic impacts of the proposed project to levels considered less than significant. This Alternative would not obtain the objectives of the proposed project.

6.5 Alternative B Analysis

DESCRIPTION

Alternative B assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .70 FAR for the MP-TOD zone and .50 FAR for the MP-I and MP-C zones. The Preferred Alternative (the proposed Specific Plan) would also allow for development intensities of up to .70 FAR for the MP-TOD zone and .50 FAR for the MP-I zone. However, the Preferred Alternative would only allow certain projects that meet certain criteria to be developed at the maximum FARs. Development over the base FARs of the proposed Specific Plan (.55 for the MP-TOD and .40 for the MP-I) would also require an allocation from the two million square foot floating pool. Alternative B would not include the floating pool of two million square-feet, and would establish the base FARs at .70 for all properties in the MP-TOD zone and .50 for all properties in the MP-I zone. Therefore, the development intensity of Alternative B would be higher than the development intensity of the proposed Specific Plan. The type of allowed land uses in these zones would be the same as the uses allowed in the proposed Specific Plan. Alternative B would not include the floating pool of two million square-feet or the Transfer of Development Rights Program. The development potential of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under Alternative B is detailed in Table 6-3 below

Currently, there is a total of 15,616,373 square-feet of developed building floor space in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment projects in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area could result in the construction of 12,248,131 additional square-feet of building space (floor area) under Alternative B. On average, 340 square-feet of industrial/office space can support one job. Therefore, Alternative B has the potential to generate approximately 36,024 additional jobs within the Moffett Park Specific Plan.

Impacts under this alternative would generally be greater than those of the proposed project as described in the subsections below. Alternative B would generally satisfy the objectives of the proposed project.

6.6 Alternative B Impact Evaluation

AESTHETICS

Future development under the direction of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in less than significant visual impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures. The visual impacts of Alternative B would be difficult to assess since there are a number of uses and architectural styles that could potentially be developed in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Nonetheless, buildout of Alternative B would have a greater density and intensity of development when compared to the proposed project. Future development projects (depending on the type of use) would likely look similar to the existing development projects in the area. Therefore, the overall character or image of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would not substantially change beyond existing conditions. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.1 could be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts of this Alternative to a less than significant level.

**Table 6-3
Building Potential of Moffett Park Specific Plan Area
Under Alternative B**

Areas	Parcel Acreage	Developable Acreage ¹	FAR	Development Potential: Total Allowed Building Square-Footage
MP-TOD	462.3	392.5	.70	12.0 million
MP-I	681.1	663.2	.50	14.4 million
MP-C	13.0	13.0	.50	246,000 ²
Special Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative (excludes existing and/or recently approved projects)³	1,156.4	1,068.7	N/A	26.65 million
Total Development Potential of this Alternative (includes existing and/or recently approved projects)⁴	1,156.4	1,068.7	N/A	27.86 million

Notes:

1. "Developable Acreage" for each area excludes existing SCVWD right-of-ways and U.S. Military Parcels.
2. Approximately 246,000 square feet of existing commercial space is currently developed within the Specific Plan on several parcels that total 13.0 acres. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that these parcels are fully developed with viable uses and would remain frozen (i.e., new development/redevelopment would not likely occur on the commercial parcels because they are already developed with viable uses).
3. The "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative" does not consider the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects.
4. The "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" considers the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. Several existing and/or approved projects have FARs greater than the FARs allowed under this alternative. Therefore, when considering existing and recently approved conditions, the "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" is greater than the "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative".

AIR QUALITY

Future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Impacts related to construction-related emissions (PM₁₀) could be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures. Vehicle trips generated by future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would generate emissions that would exceed air quality standards. Mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts related to vehicle emissions.

As with implementation of the Specific Plan, construction-related emissions generated by future development projects under the Alternative B scenario could also be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures.

The development potential of Alternative B (total of 27.9 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative B (estimated at 36,024 employees) would be greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed

Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, vehicle trips and related vehicle emissions to the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would be substantially increased with Alternative B.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential cultural resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative B would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed Specific Plan, future development under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential biological resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative B would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, future development project under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential biological resource impacts to less than significant levels.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential geology and soils impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative B would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential geologic impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative B would not likely reduce the less than significant geology and soils impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative B (total of 27.9 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative A (estimated at 36,024 employees) would be greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, in the event of a seismic earthquake, this Alternative would expose more building space and more people to potential harm or danger than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative B would result in slightly greater potential geology and soil impacts than the proposed project.

HAZARDS

Potential hazards impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative B would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential hazards impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative B would not likely reduce the less than significant hazards impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative B (total of 27.9 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative B (estimated at 36,024 employees) would be greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative B would expose more building

space and more people to potential hazards than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative B would result in slightly greater hazards impacts than the proposed project.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Future development projects under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would result in short-term construction and long-term operational hydrology and water quality impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts.

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative B would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative B would allow more development than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, future development that would occur as a result of Alternative B would likely have more impervious surface area than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, drainage and water quality impacts would be considered slightly greater under Alternative B than the proposed project.

LAND USE

The proposed Specific Plan would allow for future development projects that would be compatible with the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area. The proposed Specific Plan would also be consistent with the overall goals and policies of the City of Sunnyvale General Plan. Therefore, less than significant land use impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative B would result in similar land use impacts as the proposed project. Like the proposed project, land use impacts would be considered less than significant.

NOISE

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would involve short-term and long-term noise impacts generated by construction activities and the introduction of additional traffic along the project study area roadways and intersections. Project B would result in noise impacts that are greater than the proposed project because it would generate more employees and vehicle trips. The noise impacts of Alternative B would still be considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale, which would further impact the City's jobs/housing ratio. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Alternative B would also increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale through the future redevelopment and intensification of the project area. The development potential of Alternative B (total of 27.9 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative B (estimated at 36,024 employees) would be greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative B, when compared to the proposed Specific Plan, would further impact the jobs/housing ratio of the City.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire, police, and school services in the City of Sunnyvale. Potentially significant impacts would likely be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. Future development that would occur with Alternative B would also increase the demand for public services beyond existing conditions. Mitigation measures could also be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts. The development potential of Alternative B (total of 27.9 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Alternative B would therefore result in a greater demand on public services than the proposed Specific Plan.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As described in Section 3.12, Traffic and Circulation, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would facilitate future development that would generate additional local and regional vehicle trips. Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur along several freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections despite the implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of Alternative B would increase the level and severity of impact at all freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections because it would generate substantially more local and regional vehicle trips. Therefore, the impacts that would occur with the Implementation of Alternative B would be considered substantially more than the impacts that would be anticipated to occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.

UTILITIES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for public utilities. However, the Specific Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of the utility and infrastructure requirements required to service the proposed land uses. Implementation of the Specific Plan would require major improvements to utility and infrastructure systems, including water, wastewater, and storm drain improvements. Construction of these improvements would result in short-term construction-related impacts that would be considered, upon completion, less than significant.

Future development that would occur with the implementation of Alternative B would also increase the demand for public utilities. The development potential of Alternative B (total of 27.9 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Implementation of Alternative B would require similar mitigation measures as the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative B would be considered greater than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

6.7 Alternative B Conclusion

This alternative would increase the severity, intensity, and level of significance of most of the impacts associated with the proposed project. Impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative B would include population and housing and traffic and circulation impacts. This Alternative would satisfy the objectives of the proposed project as stated in Section 2.5.

6.8 Alternative C Analysis

DESCRIPTION

Alternative C assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .50 FAR for all parcels in the Specific Plan Area. All parcels would be zoned MP-I. Alternative C would not include the MP-TOD and MP-C zones, the floating pool of two million square-feet, or the Transfer of Development Rights Program. The development potential of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under Alternative C is detailed in Table 6-4 below:

Table 6-4 Building Potential of Moffett Park Specific Plan Area Under Alternative C				
Areas	Parcel Acreage	Developable Acreage¹	FAR	Development Potential: Total Allowed Building Square-Footage
MP-TOD	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MP-I	1,156.4	1,066.7	.50	23.3 million
MP-C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative (excludes existing and/or recently approved projects)²	1,156	1,066.7	N/A	23.3 million
Total Development Potential of this Alternative (includes existing and/or recently approved projects)³	1,156	1,066	N/A	24.5 million
Notes: 1. "Developable Acreage" for each area excludes existing SCVWD right-of-ways and U.S. Military Parcels. 2. The "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative" does not consider the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. 3. The "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" considers the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. Several existing and/or approved projects have FARs greater than the FARs allowed under this alternative. Therefore, when considering existing and recently approved conditions, the "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" is greater than the "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative".				

Currently, there is 15,616,373 square-feet of building space in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment projects in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area could result in the construction of 8,865,566 additional square-feet of building space under Alternative C. On average, 340 square-feet of industrial/office space can support one job. Therefore, Alternative C has the potential to generate approximately 26,075 additional jobs within the Moffett Park Specific Plan.

Impacts under this alternative would generally be greater than those of the proposed project as described in the subsections below. Alternative C would generally satisfy the objectives of the proposed project.

6.9 Alternative C Impact Evaluation

AESTHETICS

Future development under the direction of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in less than significant visual impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures. The visual impacts of Alternative C would be difficult to assess since there are a number of uses and architectural styles that could potentially be developed in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Nonetheless, buildout of Alternative C would have a slightly greater density and intensity of development when compared to the proposed project. Future development projects (depending on the type of use) would likely look similar to the existing development projects in the area. Therefore, the overall character or image of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would not substantially change beyond existing conditions. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.1 could be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts of this Alternative to a less than significant level.

AIR QUALITY

Future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Impacts related to construction-related emissions (PM_{10}) could be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures. Vehicle trips generated by future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would generate emissions that would exceed air quality standards. Mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts related to vehicle emissions.

As with implementation of the Specific Plan, construction-related emissions generated by future development projects under the Alternative C scenario could also be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures.

The development potential of Alternative C (total of 24.5 million square-feet) would be slightly greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative C (estimated at 26,075 employees) would be slightly greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, vehicle trips and related vehicle emissions to the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would be slightly increased with Alternative C.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential biological resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative C would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, future development project under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential biological resource impacts to less than significant levels.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential cultural resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative C would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the

proposed Specific Plan, future development under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential geology and soils impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative C would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential geologic impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative C would not likely reduce the less than significant geology and soils impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative C (total of 24.5 million square-feet) would be slightly greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative C (estimated at 26,075 employees) would be greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, in the event of a seismic earthquake, this Alternative would expose slightly more building space and more people to potential harm or danger than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative C would result in slightly greater potential geology and soil impacts than the proposed project.

HAZARDS

Potential hazards impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative C would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential hazards impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative C would not likely reduce the less than significant hazards impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative C (total of 24.5 million square-feet) would be slightly greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative C (estimated at 26,075 employees) would be greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative C would expose more building space and more people to potential hazards than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative C would result in slightly greater hazards impacts than the proposed project.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Future development projects under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would result in short-term construction and long-term operational hydrology and water quality impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts.

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative C would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative.

Alternative C would allow more development than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, future development that would occur as a result of Alternative C would likely have more impervious surface area than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, drainage and water quality impacts would be considered slightly greater under Alternative C than the proposed project.

LAND USE

The proposed Specific Plan would allow for future development projects that would be compatible with the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area. The proposed Specific Plan would also be consistent with the overall goals and policies of the City of Sunnyvale General Plan. Therefore, less than significant land use impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative C would result in similar land use impacts as the proposed project. Like the proposed project, land use impacts would be considered less than significant.

NOISE

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would involve short-term and long-term noise impacts generated by construction activities and the introduction of additional traffic along the project study area roadways and intersections. Project C would result in noise impacts that are slightly greater than the proposed project because it would generate slightly more employees and vehicle trips. The noise impacts of Alternative C would still be considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale, which would further impact the City's jobs/housing ratio. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Alternative C would also increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale through the future redevelopment and intensification of the site. The development potential of Alternative C (total of 24.5 million square-feet) would be slightly greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative C (estimated at 26,075 employees) would be slightly greater than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative C would result in a slightly greater jobs/housing ratio impact than the proposed project.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire, police, and school services in the City of Sunnyvale. Potentially significant impacts would likely be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. Future development that would occur with Alternative C would also increase the demand for public services beyond existing conditions. Mitigation measures could also be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts. The development potential of Alternative C (total of 25.4 million square-feet) would be slightly greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative C would be considered slightly greater than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As described in Section 3.12, Traffic and Circulation, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would facilitate future development that would generate additional local and regional vehicle trips. Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur along several freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections despite the implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of Alternative C would increase the level of impact at all freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections because it would generate more local and regional vehicle trips. Therefore, the impacts that would occur with the Implementation of Alternative C would be considered greater than the impacts that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.

UTILITIES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for public utilities. However, the Specific Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of the utility and infrastructure requirements required to service the proposed land uses. Implementation of the Specific Plan would require major improvements to utility and infrastructure systems, including water, wastewater, and storm drain improvements. Construction of these improvements would result in short-term impacts that would be considered less than significant.

Future development that would occur with the implementation of Alternative C would also increase the demand for public utilities. The development potential of Alternative C (total of 24.5 million square-feet) would be substantially greater than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative C would be considered slightly greater than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

6.10 Alternative C Conclusion

This alternative would increase the severity, intensity, and level of significance of most of the impacts associated with the proposed project. Impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative C would include air quality, population and housing, and traffic and circulation impacts. This Alternative would satisfy the objectives of the proposed project as stated in Section 2.5.

6.11 Alternative D Analysis

DESCRIPTION

Alternative D assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .55 FAR for the MP-TOD zone and .40 for the MP-C and MP-I zones. The type of allowed land uses in these zones would be the same as the uses allowed in the proposed Specific Plan. Alternative D would not include the floating pool of two million square-feet, or the Transfer of Development Rights Program. The development potential of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under Alternative B is detailed in Table 6-5 below:

**Table 6-5
Building Potential of Moffett Park Specific Plan Area
Under Alternative D**

Areas	Parcel Acreage	Developable Acreage¹	FAR	Development Potential: Total Allowed Building Square-Footage
MP-TOD	462.3	392.2	.55	9.4 million
MP-I	681.1	663.2	.40	11.6 million
MP-C	13.0	13.0	.4	246,000 ²
Special Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative (excludes existing and/or recently approved projects)²	1,156.4	1,066.7	N/A	21.2 million
Total Development Potential of this Alternative (includes existing and/or recently approved projects)³	1,156.4	1,066.7	N/A	22.4 million

Notes:

1. "Developable Acreage" for each area excludes existing SCVWD right-of-ways and U.S. Military Parcels.
2. Approximately 246,000 square feet of existing commercial space is currently developed within the Specific Plan on several parcels that total 13.0 acres. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that these parcels are fully developed with viable uses and would remain frozen (i.e., new development/redevelopment would not likely occur on the commercial parcels because they are already developed with viable uses).
3. The "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative" does not consider the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects.
4. The "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" considers the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. Several existing and/or approved projects have FARs greater than the FARs allowed under this alternative. Therefore, when considering existing and recently approved conditions, the "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" is greater than the "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative".

Currently, there is 15,616,373 square-feet of developed building floor space in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment projects in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area could result in the construction of 6,794,506 additional square-feet of building space (floor space) under Alternative D. On average, 340 square-feet of industrial/office space can support one job. Therefore, Alternative D has the potential to generate approximately 19,984 additional jobs within the Moffett Park Specific Plan.

This alternative would avoid some project-related impacts, both positive and negative, as described in the subsections below. In addition, the objectives of the proposed project would not be achieved with the implementation of Alternative D.

6.12 Alternative D Impact Evaluation

AESTHETICS

Future development under the direction of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in less than significant visual impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures. The visual impacts of Alternative D would be difficult to assess since there are a number of uses and architectural styles that

could potentially be developed in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Nonetheless, buildout of Alternative D would result in a less dense and intense land use pattern when compared to the proposed project. Future development projects (depending on the size and type of use) would likely look similar to the existing development projects in the area. Therefore, the overall character or image of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would not substantially change beyond existing conditions. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.1 could be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts that could occur from the implementation of this Alternative to a less than significant level.

Alternative D would not likely reduce the less than significant visual impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

AIR QUALITY

Future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Impacts related to construction-related emissions (PM_{10}) could be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures. Vehicle trips generated by future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would generate emissions that would exceed air quality standards. Mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts related to vehicle emissions.

As with implementation of the Specific Plan, construction-related emissions generated by future development projects under the Alternative D scenario could also be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures.

The development potential of Alternative D (total of 22.4 million square-feet) would be less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative D (estimated at 19,984 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, vehicle trips and related vehicle emissions to the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area would be substantially reduced with Alternative D.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential biological resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative D would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, future development project under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential biological resource impacts to less than significant levels.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential cultural resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative D would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed Specific Plan, future development under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential geology and soils impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative D would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential geologic impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative D would not likely reduce the less than significant geology and soils impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative D (total of 22.4 million square-feet) would be less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative D (estimated at 19,984 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, in the event of a seismic earthquake, this Alternative would expose less building space and fewer people to potential harm or danger than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative D would result in slightly less potential geology and soil impacts than the proposed project.

HAZARDS

Potential hazards impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative D would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential hazards impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative D would not likely reduce the less than significant hazards impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

The development potential of Alternative D (total of 22.4 million square-feet) would be less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative D (estimated at 19,984 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative D would expose less building space and fewer people to potential hazards than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative D would result in less hazards impacts than the proposed project.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Future development projects under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would result in short-term construction and long-term operational hydrology and water quality impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts.

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative D would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative D would allow less development than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, future development that would occur as a result of Alternative D would likely have less impervious surface area than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, drainage and water quality impacts would be considered slightly less under Alternative D than the proposed project.

LAND USE

The proposed Specific Plan would allow for future development projects that would be compatible with the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area. The proposed Specific Plan would also be consistent with the overall goals and policies of the City of Sunnyvale General Plan. Therefore, less than significant land use impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative D would result in similar land use impacts as the proposed project. Like the proposed project, land use impacts would be considered less than significant.

NOISE

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would involve short-term and long-term noise impacts generated by construction activities and the introduction of additional traffic along the project study area roadways and intersections. Although project impacts would be considered less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures, Alternative D would likely reduce traffic noise impacts because it would generate less employment and traffic than the proposed project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale, which would further impact the City's jobs/housing ratio. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Alternative D would also increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale through the future redevelopment and intensification of the site. The development potential of Alternative D (total of 22.4 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the additional employment that could be generated by Alternative D (estimated at 19,984 employees) would be less than the additional employment that could be generated by the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, Alternative D would result in substantially less jobs/housing ratio impacts than the proposed project. However, the implementation of Alternative D would not likely reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire, police, and school services in the City of Sunnyvale. Potentially significant impacts would likely be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. Future development that would occur with Alternative D would also increase the demand for public services beyond existing conditions. Mitigation measures could also be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts. The development potential of Alternative D (total of 22.4 million square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative D would be considered less than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As described in Section 3.12, Traffic and Circulation, and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would facilitate future development that would generate additional vehicle trips. Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur along several freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections despite the implementation of mitigation measure. Implementation of Alternative D would decrease the level of impact at all freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections because it would generate substantially less vehicle trips. However, significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would still occur with the implementation of Alternative D despite the implementation of mitigation measures.

UTILITIES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for public utilities. However, the Specific Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of the utility and infrastructure requirements required to service the proposed land uses. Implementation of the Specific Plan would require major improvements to utility and infrastructure systems, including water, wastewater, and storm drain improvements. Construction of these improvements would result in short-term impacts that would be considered less than significant.

Future development that would occur with the implementation of Alternative D would also increase the demand for public utilities. The development potential of Alternative D (total of 22.4 million-square-feet) would be substantially less than the development potential of the proposed Specific Plan (total of 24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, the less than significant public service impacts generated by Alternative D would be considered slightly less than the less than significant impacts of the proposed project.

6.13 Alternative D Conclusion

Alternative D would result in fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project. This alternative would avoid and/or reduce most of the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project. However, this Alternative would not likely reduce the significant and unavoidable air quality, population and housing, and traffic impacts of the proposed project to levels considered less than significant. This Alternative would not obtain the objectives of the proposed project.

6.14 Alternative E Analysis

DESCRIPTION

Alternative E assumes development and adoption of a Specific Plan that would allow for development intensities of .50 FAR for the MP-TOD and .35 for the MP-I zone. The type of allowed land uses in these zones would be generally the same as the uses allowed in the proposed Specific Plan with a couple of exceptions. Alternative E would allow the construction of residential development (greater than 35 units per acre), mixed use, and increased pedestrian amenities near transit stations. Pedestrian amenities would include retail, service businesses, restaurants, plazas, and landscaped pedestrian paths and sidewalks. Approximately 3,583 units could be constructed on parcels near light rail stations under Alternative E. Alternative E would not include the MP-C zone, the floating pool of two million square-feet, or the Transfer of Development Rights Program. The development potential of the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under Alternative E is detailed in Table 6-6 below:

**Table 6-6
Building Potential of Moffett Park Specific Plan Area
Under Alternative E**

Areas	Parcel Acreage	Developable Acreage¹	FAR	Development Potential: Total Allowed Building Square-Footage
MP-TOD	175.5	173.5	.50	3.8 million
MP-I	980.9	893.2	.35	13.6 million
MP-C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,583 residential units or approximately 3.6 million sq. feet. ⁴
Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative (excludes existing and/or recently approved projects)²	1,156.4	1,066.7	N/A	17.4 million (office/Industrial) 3.6 million (residential) 21.0 million (total)
Total Development Potential of this Alternative (includes existing and/or recently approved projects)³	1,156.4	1,066.7	N/A	18.6 million (office/Industrial) 3.6 million (residential) 22.2 million (total)

Notes:

1. "Developable Acreage" for each area excludes existing SCVWD right-of-ways and U.S. Military Parcels.
2. The "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative" does not consider the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects.
3. The "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" considers the square footage of existing and/or recently approved projects. Several existing and/or approved projects have FARs greater than the FARs allowed under this alternative. Therefore, when considering existing and recently approved conditions, the "Total Development Potential of this Alternative" is greater than the "Total Development Allowed by the FARs for this Alternative".
4. Assumes that the average size of a residential unit is 1,200 square-feet.

Currently, there are 15,616,373 square-feet of building space in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment projects in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area could result in the construction of 18,645,771 additional square-feet of building space (excluding the residential units) under Alternative E. On average, 340 square-feet of industrial/office space can support one job. Therefore, Alternative E has the potential to generate approximately 8,910 additional jobs within the Moffett Park Specific Plan. This alternative also has the potential to generate 3,583 housing units. The total development potential of the proposed project (assuming the average house of 1,000 square-feet) would be approximately 22,228,771 square-feet of industrial/office and residential building space.

This alternative would avoid some project-related impacts, both positive and negative, as described in the subsections below. This alternative would also generate potentially significant air quality, land use, hazards and noise impacts. The objectives of the proposed project would generally be achieved with the implementation of this Alternative.

6.15 Alternative E Impact Evaluation

AESTHETICS

Future development under the direction of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in less than significant visual impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures. The visual impacts of Alternative E would be difficult to assess since there are a number of uses and architectural styles that could potentially be developed in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Alternative E would introduce new high-density residential development into the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. Residential development would modify, but not likely degrade, the character and image of the area. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.1 could be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts of this Alternative to a less than significant level.

AIR QUALITY

Future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Impacts related to construction-related emissions (PM_{10}) could be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures. Vehicle trips generated by future development that would be facilitated with the implementation of the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan would generate emissions that would exceed air quality standards. Mitigation measures Would reduce potentially significant impacts related to vehicle emissions.

As with implementation of the Specific Plan, construction-related emissions generated by future development projects under the Alternative E scenario could also be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard mitigation measures.

Alternative E would generate approximately the same number of vehicle trips as the proposed project. Therefore, vehicle emission impacts that would occur from implementation of Alternative E would be approximately the same as the vehicle emission impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan

Alternative E would also introduce sensitive receptors (residential units) into an industrial area of the City. Air emissions from existing and future manufacturing operations in the area could potentially result in negative air quality effects on individuals living in the area. In addition, the Sunnyvale Materials Recovery and Transfer (SMaRT[®]) Station and the City of Sunnyvale Water Pollution Control Plant would expose residences in the area to objectionable odors. Therefore, Alternative E would result in additional air quality/odor impacts. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential biological resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative E would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, future development project under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential biological resource impacts to less than significant levels.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential cultural resource impacts that could occur with the implementation of Alternative E would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed Specific Plan, future development under this Alternative would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential geology and soils impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative E would be similar to those that could occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential geologic impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative E would not likely reduce the less than significant geology and soils impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

Alternative E would have less building potential (22.2 million square-feet of office/industrial and residential space) than the proposed project (24.3 million square-feet). Therefore, Alternative E would expose less building space to potential geologic hazards than the proposed project. Buildout of Alternative E would generate approximately 8,910 jobs and would provide housing for approximately 10,018 persons (assuming that the average persons per household in the City of Sunnyvale is remains at approximately 2.6). Therefore, an additional 18,928 people would be living and/or working in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under alternative E. This number would be substantially lower than the number of people working in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area under the proposed Specific Plan (estimated at 25,588 employees). Therefore, in the event of a seismic earthquake, this Alternative would expose less building space and fewer people to potential harm or danger than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative E would result in slightly less potential geology and soil impacts then the proposed project.

HAZARDS

Potential hazards impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative E would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential hazards impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative E would not likely reduce the less than significant hazards impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact.

Alternative E would also introduce sensitive receptors (residential units) into an industrial area of the City. Industrial uses in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area routinely transport, store, and utilize hazardous materials. Military, defense, and aerospace industries in the area also transport, store, and utilize highly explosive materials. In general, industrial uses that typically involve hazardous materials and explosive materials are separated from sensitive receptors, including schools, hospitals, and residential units, for health and safety reasons. For these reasons, Alternative E, with its emphasis on residential development, would be viewed as an incompatible land use in the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan area. Introducing residential uses into the area would therefore increase the potential for hazards to occur. Therefore, the impacts of Alternative E would be considered potentially significant.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Future development projects under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would result in short-term construction and long-term operational hydrology and water quality impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts.

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts that could occur with the implementation Alternative E would be similar to those that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be implemented on a project-by-project basis to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative E would not likely reduce the less than significant hydrology and water quality impacts of the proposed project to a level of no impact. The hydrology and water quality impacts that would occur from the implementation of Alternative E would be approximately the same as the impacts that would occur with the implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.

LAND USE

The proposed Specific Plan would allow for future development projects that would be compatible with the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area. The proposed Specific Plan would also be consistent with the overall goals and policies of the City of Sunnyvale General Plan. Therefore, less than significant land use impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative E would allow for the future construction of residential uses in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area. The Moffett Park Specific Plan Area is currently a heavy industrial zone. Generally, residential land uses are not compatible with industrial uses because of the noise, air pollution, odors, and potential hazards generated by industrial uses. The construction of residential uses in the Moffett Park Specific Plan, depending on the location and design of the future, individual project, could result in significant land use compatibility impacts with existing and future industrial uses in the area. This Alternative assumes that the location of residential uses would be located along the rail corridor. Therefore, potentially significant land use impacts would occur under Alternative E.

NOISE

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would involve short-term and long-term noise impacts generated by construction activities and the introduction of additional traffic along the project study area roadways and intersections. Project E would result in noise impacts that are slightly less than the proposed project because it would generate slightly less employees and vehicle trips.

Buildout of Alternative E would introduce sensitive noise receptors into Moffett Park Specific Plan Area by allowing for the construction of over 3,580 residential units. This would expose sensitive receptors to noise that is typical of industrial operations, including the operation of heavy equipment and large truck and vehicle traffic. In addition, sensitive receptors in the area would be subject to noise from the light rail, buses, and aircraft from Moffett Field. Therefore, locating sensitive receptors in the area could result in potentially significant noise impacts. Impacts could be mitigated to less than significant levels by special design techniques, including sound barriers and the use of acoustically rated windows and doors in residential construction. Nonetheless, even with mitigation designed to reduce the potential noise impacts to less than significant levels, the noise impacts of Alternative E would still be considered greater than those of the proposed project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Future development projects that would occur under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale, which would further impact the City's jobs/housing ratio. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Alternative E would also increase the number of jobs in the City of Sunnyvale through the future redevelopment and intensification of the site. However, the employment that could be potentially generated as a result of Alternative E (8,910 jobs) would be substantially lower than the employment that could be generated as a result of the proposed Specific Plan (25,588). In addition, Alternative E would allow the construction of over 3,580 housing units, which would help to mitigate the jobs-housing ratio impact. Therefore, Alternative E would reduce the jobs-housing impact of the proposed project (see Table 6-7 for comparative analysis of environmental impacts associated with all project alternatives)

PUBLIC SERVICES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire, police, and school services in the City of Sunnyvale. Potentially significant impacts would likely be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. Future development that would occur with Alternative E would also increase the demand for public services beyond existing conditions. Mitigation measures could also be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with Alternative E to less than significant levels.

Buildout of Alternative E could include over 3,580 residential units. Residential development generally requires more public services than industrial developments because it generates a higher demand for schools, parks and recreation facilities, and police and fire protection than office/industrial uses. Therefore, the public service impacts of Alternative E would likely be greater than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As described in Section 3.12, Traffic and Circulation, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would facilitate future development that would generate additional local and regional vehicle trips. Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur along several freeway segments, roadways, and isolated intersections despite the implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of Alternative E would result in similar impacts as implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, as it would generate approximately the same number of trips in the AM and PM peak hours.

UTILITIES

Future development under the direction of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for public utilities. However, the Specific Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of the utility and infrastructure requirements required to service the proposed land uses. Implementation of the Specific Plan would require major improvements to utility and infrastructure systems, including water, wastewater, and storm drain improvements. Construction of these improvements would result in short-term impacts that would be considered less than significant.

Future development that would occur with the implementation of Alternative E would also increase the demand for public utilities. Buildout of Alternative E could include over 3,580 residential units.

Residential development generally requires more utility services than industrial developments because it generates a higher demand for water, wastewater, and solid waste services than office/industrial uses. Therefore, the utility service demands of Alternative E would likely be greater than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

6.16 Alternative E Conclusion

This alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable population and housing impact of the proposed Specific Plan to a less than significant level with mitigation because it would include the residential land uses. However, because of the residential land uses, Alternative E would result in additional potentially significant hazards, land use compatibility, and noise impacts. Significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and traffic and circulation would also occur under Alternative E.

6.17 “Environmentally Superior” Alternative

The objectives of the proposed Specific Plan are described in detail in Section 2.4, *Project Objectives*. The potentially significant impacts that would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Specific Plan are set forth in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, of this EIR. As noted in Section 3.0, most of the potentially significant impacts identified for the proposed project can be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures. However, significant unavoidable impacts related to traffic, air quality, and population and housing would occur as a result of the proposed project. In addition, the project would also contribute to cumulative air quality, population and housing, growth-inducing, water supply, energy, and traffic impacts (refer to Section 4.0, *Cumulative Impacts*, and Section 7.0, *Growth-Inducing Effects of the Proposed Project*). Consequently, while the proposed Specific Plan is the City’s preferred project because it responds directly to the goals and objectives referenced above, due to the potential cumulative and significant unavoidable impacts, it is not necessarily the “Environmentally Superior” Alternative.

CEQA requires that an Environmentally Superior Alternative be identified; that is, an alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. If the No-Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that another alternative be chosen as the environmentally superior alternative, which could feasibly attain most of the Project objectives.

A comparison of the alternatives with the proposed Project is provided in Table 6-7. Alternative A, the No-Project Alternative, would have fewer and/or less substantial impacts in all the environmental topic areas except for aesthetics and biological resources, which would generally be the same level of impact as the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative A would be considered the environmentally superior Alternative. However, an environmentally superior alternative must be chosen other than the No-Project Alternative (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126 (e)(2)). Based on the analysis in this Section, the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative D. This alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce the level of impact in most of the environmental topic areas. However, significant and unavoidable traffic and population and housing impacts would still likely occur with the implementation of this alternative. Alternative D would generally satisfy most of the objectives of the proposed project, as outlined in Section 2.5 of this document.

Table 6-7
Comparative Analysis of Environmental Impacts Associated
With the Project Alternatives

	Propose d Project	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Aesthetics	M	M+	M+-	M+-	M+-	M+-
Air Quality	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	M+-
Biological Resources	M	M+-	M+-	M+-	M+-	M+-
Geology and Soils	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	M-
Cultural Resources	M	M+-	M+-	M+-	M+-	M+-
Hazards	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	P+
Hydrology and Water Quality	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	M+-
Land Use	L	N+-	L+-	L+-	L+-	P+
Noise	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	P+
Population and Housing	S	S-	S+	S+	S-	L-
Public Services	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	M+
Traffic	S	S-	S+	S+	S-	S+-
Utilities	M	M-	M+	M+	M-	M+
N No Impact L Less Than Significant Impact M Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation P Potentially Significant Impact (level of significance would be based on location and design of future development) S Significant and Unavoidable Impact + Level of impact is considered greater than the proposed project - Level of impact is considered less than the proposed project +- Level of impact is considered to be generally the same as the proposed project						